DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 077 777 SO 001 712

TITLE	Challenges to the Disciplines: Contexts for the Liberal Arts.
INSTITUTION	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	21 Jun 70
NOTE	47p.; Report of a TTT Cluster Workshop, Miami, Florida, June 21-22, 1970
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Conference Reports; Higher Education; Humanities; *Humanities Instruction; *Humanization; Intellectual Disciplines; *Liberal Arts; Teacher Education; Teacher Educators; *Teacher Workshops
IDENTIFIERS	*Training Teacher Trainers Project

ABSTRACT

This conference report begins with a statement of purpose and an outline of organization for the conference. Three topics--human development, studies for all men, and teachers and teaching--were related to the liberal arts, the humanities, and the disciplines and were to be brought to focus by three synthesizing reports after the completion of the conference. Of the two reports included here, John Zell's deals with the anxiety involved in change despite its desirability in humanizing the humanities. Paul Olsen deals with the act of teaching and its translation by purposeful action into a humanizing action; it speaks specifically of insights gained during a student strike over Cambodia. Reactions to both the content and the organization of the conference from the resource people in attendance completes the critical content of the report. Participant's names and daily schedules are appended. (JH)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 077777

The Year of the Liberal Arts

Spool 7 13

CHALLENGES TO THE DISCIPLINES
CONTEXTS FOR THE LIBERAL ARTS

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN
ATING IT POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Of this ultimate intention the present volume is merely portent and fragment, experiment, dissonant prologue. Since it is intended, among other things, as a swindle, an insult, and a corrective, the reader will be wise to bear the nominal subject, and his expectation of its proper treatment, steadily in mind. For that is the subject with which the authors are dealing, throughout. If complications arise, that is because they are trying to deal with it not as journalists, sociologists, politicians, entertainers, humanitarians, priests, or artists, but seriously . . .

JAMES AGEE

ED 077777

TRAINING THE TRAINERS OF TEACHERS

Miami, Florida
June 21, 22, 23, 1970

CHALLENGES TO THE DISCIPLINES
CONTEXTS FOR THE LIBERAL ARTS

Report of a TTT Cluster Workshop
sponsored by the
Southern and Great Lakes Clusters,
part of the TTT Program supported by
the U.S. Office of Education

On all the subjects the knowledge of which is important for the business of living, what life is, what human nature is, what the mind is, what the body is, the scholar knows more than other people. It shouldn't lie outside his sphere to gather up that knowledge and present to the rest of us his conceptions, his understanding, of these great realities. But that means he must contemplate his subject as a whole, not only research in his particular corner of it. Such contemplation is out of repute, no business for the honest scholar.

ROBERT M. MACIVER

INTRODUCTION

"The Year of the Liberal Arts" conference, held in Phoenix in May, 1970, was the initial national TTT effort to focus the attention of TTT projects on general issues related to the role of the Liberal Arts, the Disciplines, and the Humanities in the training of teachers. That workshop was sponsored by the West Coast and Southwest Clusters of the TTT Program, joined by representatives from the other Clusters. The workshop in Miami was a follow-up to the Phoenix Conference, sponsored by the Southern and Great Lakes Clusters. Participants in the workshop included teams of representatives from each of the TTT projects in these two clusters, the cluster directors from the Northeastern, Midwestern, Southwestern and West Coast Clusters, several members of the TTT Leadership Training Institute, representatives of the U.S. Office of Education, three keynoter-synthesizers and sixteen resource persons.

Because this workshop was a follow-up to the Phoenix Conference, no attempt was made to redraw the contexts examined or to reiterate the challenges made to the Liberal Arts, Disciplines, and Humanities, at Phoenix. Rather, three broad contexts were extrapolated from the Phoenix Conference within which challenges to the Liberal Arts could be discussed and developed on a more personal and specific level. The workshop was structured to bring together project participants and resource persons into small groups to discuss these issues and to draw out of the discussions implications and suggested courses of action for the TTT projects represented and for the TTT Program as a whole. The issues to which the workshop addressed itself were:

I. HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

Learning--and Disciplines?
Humanization--and Humanities?
Liberation--and Liberal Arts?

II. STUDIES FOR ALL MEN

Black Studies!
Brown Studies!
Asian Studies!
White Studies!
Disciplines?--Humanities?--Liberal Arts?

III. TEACHERS AND TEACHING

The Teaching Act--Liberation
Teaching Involvement--Humanization
Content and Curriculum--Discipline
Liberal Arts?--Humanities?--Disciplines?

PROGRAM

Sunday evening's sessions served as a general introduction to the workshop and the issues. Then, in order to facilitate discussion in Monday's sessions, each participant was asked on Sunday evening to briefly respond in writing to two of the issues: first, to the issue with which he had some experience and from which he could contribute in a group; second, to the issue with which he had had less experience and which he would like to explore with others in a group session.

On Monday, each participant was assigned to two groups, one which discussed the issues he wished to explore and the other which discussed the issue to which his experience made a contribution. All groups had discussion leader-recorders who attempted to draw from the discussions the most pertinent contributions and areas of exploration.

On Tuesday, the focus shifted from discussion of the issues to synthesis and application to the projects and to the TTT Program. Thus participants were grouped by projects on Tuesday, and resource persons were assigned to work with specific projects.

At the Tuesday noon session, each keynoter-synthesizer presented a synthesis of his issue. These were followed by suggestions of new directions and next steps made by representatives of the USOE and LTI. The workshop

closed with reactions, questions, suggestions, etc., from the floor. (Details of the workshop format can be found in the appendix).

KEYNOTER-SYNTHESIZERS

In developing a workshop that would facilitate a personal examination of the issues with which the Liberal Arts, Disciplines and Humanities are challenged, and the specific implications of these issues within TTT, it was decided to forgo the traditional format of presenting formal addresses at the outset of the conference, in favor of inviting three persons, each of whose area of expertise was specifically related to one of the issues, to participate throughout the conference as keynoter-synthesizers. The three keynoter-synthesizers were: Dr. John Zell, Psychiatrist, Phoenix, Arizona (Human Development); Dr. Paul Olson, Professor of English, University of Nebraska (Teachers and Teaching); and Dr. Anthony Campbell, Urban Education Specialist, Washington, D.C. (Studies for All Men).

These three eminently qualified people contributed to the conduct of the workshop in a number of ways. Each of them introduced, in brief keynote remarks on Sunday evening, the relevant and critical parameters of his issue. During the workshop, they participated in group meetings, resource sessions and informal discussions, focusing on significant dimensions of the issues as they were developed and discussed, and attempting to glean from these sessions the response to the issues and the implications of these for "next steps" in teacher education. On the last day of the conference, the keynoter-synthesizers met with the resource persons to obtain their feedback on the issues and the major outcomes of the conference. At the Tuesday luncheon, as mentioned above,

they summarized briefly their reactions, responses, and suggestions around the issues of the conference.

During the several weeks following the workshop, each of the keynoter-synthesizers prepared a more formal statement of his synthesis of the issues and the approaches that might be taken to them. These written syntheses are included here in their entirety, beginning on page 6. They reflect the considered participation in, and reflection on, the challenges to the Disciplines and contexts for the Liberal Arts as they were met and dealt with in Miami.

RESOURCE PERSONS

Sixteen additional persons, whose experience, position and professional competencies lent a broad national perspective to the challenges to the Liberal Arts, were invited to participate in the conference as resource persons. The role of the resource persons was an informal one. They were not asked to formalize a presentation or to act as discussion leaders. Rather they were available as consultants whose expertise, rather than "expert" role, could be tapped by all conference participants as issues and implications and strategies for dealing with them were developed. Resource persons were asked to participate in group discussions, to hold small group resource sessions for participants from all projects and to consult with teams from projects on their specific plans and problems.

On the last day of the workshop the resource persons met as a group with the three keynoter-synthesizers to discuss with them their reactions to the conference and together to formulate summaries of these reactions and suggestions for directions that might be taken by the projects and the Clusters

in further meeting the challenges of TTT and the Disciplines. Many of the major reactions of the resource persons have thus been incorporated into the syntheses of the keynoter-synthesizer.

Several resource persons also submitted individually a brief report of their reactions to the conference. These reports included reactions to the issues and challenges of the workshop as well as to its structure and format. Because reactions were as varied as the perspectives and expertise of the resource persons themselves, no attempt has been made to summarize their remarks. Instead, we have quoted selected excerpts from the reports so that the reader may better appreciate the variety of approaches and attitudes represented in Miami by the resource persons. These excerpts have been included, following the papers by the keynoter-synthesizers, on page 22.

NOTE: Dr. Campbell's written synthesis had not been received in Pittsburgh by our printing deadline. As soon as it is received, a copy will be mailed to all conference participants.

On Humanizing the Humanities

John Zell, M.D.
Phoenix, Arizona

The following remarks are a potpourri of my reactions to the conference at Miami. As I approached the subject of humanizing the humanities and reflected upon the field of my endeavor, the practice of medicine, it struck me that a central problem which faces the field of medicine today is the physician who deals in an aliented manner with the brain, the gut, the bone and the skin. He seems to be incapable of treating the human being as a total entity. In some ways this is similar to the liberal arts professor who deals with his concept of being an instructor in sociology, anthropology, philosophy, etc. by primarily referring to the subject matter rather than to the interaction between the teacher and the student. The history of medical training, until recently, demonstrated an almost single-minded focus upon intellectual excellence and an ability to master a wide range of subjects without any regard for the physician's capacities to relate to individuals in a truly humanized manner.

It seems to me that the road toward the Ph.D., in any particular subject, which is a pre-requisite for college professorship, has likewise been single-minded in its emphasis on intellectual excellence. Little or no consideration has been given to the capacity for conducting interpersonal relationships. The goal of achieving scientific excellence or scholarship in the liberal arts, may be an efficient criteria for the advanced degrees. However, when the achievement of this goal becomes linked to the teaching of young people no one to one correlation exists between the excellence of scholarship and the inspirational skill of teaching. In fact, in some

individuals, the precise personality traits which have allowed them to sacrifice interpersonal relationships for intellectual endeavor then impairs their ability to become teachers and to deal with other human beings on a dynamic level. As such, we find ourselves in a situation where people who are training and selecting prospective teachers are themselves victims of the very same system that focused on scholarship in a relatively isolated, segmented, and dehumanized educational environment. This antiquated system serves as a defensive reaction whereby the quantifiable aspect of performance is the grades and papers written ("publish or perish") rather than the more illusive quality of proficiency in interpersonal relationships. These, I realize, are old issues and have been gone over many times, but the fact that they still exist and the fact that people learn by example rather than by rhetoric suggests we need a continued critical evaluation of what teaching is and what it can be.

I would like to broaden this concept of humanizing the subject matter: humanities, black studies, and teaching, by focusing on the interpersonal aspect of the student-teacher relationship. I heard a great deal of concern expressed in this conference about the student's role being passive-receptive. This position is implicit in so many teaching attitudes. Perhaps, the act of teaching should be considered as the act of facilitation in which the teacher assists in whatever way possible to help the student learn and grow. In the process of learning about history, philosophy or whatever subject, the focus should not solely remain on the course material, but on the student's need to learn how to approach the subject, how to learn about himself, and more importantly an emphasis on genuine human relationships which exist between students and between the students and the instructor.

Freud, when he initially began his work with patients, probed the intimacies of their thought processes and discovered that his patients developed a wide-range of intense feelings about him as a person. It was after intensive effort to eliminate this unwanted emotional quality between the doctor and the patient that he came to recognize that this emotional connection was the central turning point of any therapeutic relationship. In the classroom situation I feel that the emotional interchange between student and the instructor is not a bothersome side issue but central to the act of teaching.

In all human relationships there is as much significant communication at a non-verbal level as there is in terms of what is said directly. This communication can be in the form of the university's initial and continuing attitude to an applicant, the structure of the registration process, the expectations expressed by administrators and teachers, the physical surroundings, the dormitory and housing regulations, the financial policies, the location of the instructor in the classroom, the wording and the proficiency of the textbook, implicit and explicit attitudes concerning grades, in fact, the totality of the experience. By this I do not mean to imply that the optimal acts of teaching occur only within an atmosphere of warm, positive feeling. Creative teaching does occur in situations where there are feelings of involvement, be they warm or be they hostile. Where there is a feeling of indifference learning is greatly diminished and impotent rage can flourish.

In speaking of the teacher as a facilitator, I think we need to return to some of the basic concepts of security. It is my thesis that if the security of the instructor is based only on his excellence of knowledge in the field then the teacher must guard against others knowing more than he knows. On an unconscious level the instructor can be fearful that the

student's knowledge will surpass his own. The teacher will need in some way to short circuit the learning process. However, if this security rests on his ability to help people learn, then he will more readily wish to have the individual under his instruction learn as rapidly and as creatively as is possible. The student will not represent the same unconscious threat to him. It also frees the instructor to reveal himself as a human being. The role of the teacher as a facilitator changes the role of the student as well. It requires him to be a seeker of knowledge in his own right and not a passive-receptor of things which others have learned in the past. The student is not tied to what may be for him irrelevant past experience, and he can reach toward a multiplicity of subjects, values, ideas, and even life styles. Education can be an open-ended human endeavor.

Participants of this conference have concerned themselves with many facets of education: student-radicalism, black studies, methods of teaching the humanities, and irrevelance of subjects, etc. Perhaps underlying all of these problems is an implicit consideration of basic changes in educational technique, philosophy, and administration. We are talking about change: individual change, institutional change, and cultural change. We are talking about administrators in Washington changing, policies in Washington changing, school administrators changing, teaching methods changing, and student attitudes changing.

The question that we must ask is, what security base enables professors, instructors, students, parents, and politicians to change? For evolutionary change does not happen only because we recognize injustice or inefficiency, but also because we feel secure enough to risk a different future.

I am not a sociologist, in a sense, but as I sat in the various conferences, I heard people talk about change within the context of external forces. Each individual has based his life on certain forms of gratification and has learned behavior that will lead to success. Each change that we talked about would have caused a revision of this path to success whether we are discussing the parent. the students, the teacher, or the administrator. Change to some may represent a glorious new beginning, a bright horizon toward which they strive. Other individuals talked about their identity, their roots of gratification, and the forms of security which change could endanger. This alerted me to a whole series of possibilities. The word "change", to me, represents anxiety, and whether I reflected on the experience of my offic, or I sat and listened to the discussion groups, it is evident that change represents anxiety. Regardless of which identity was focused upon, intimate self, stereotyped self or group identified self, the most outstanding factor was clearly the dynamics of change. The focus of the conference was concerned with specific subjects rather than the dynamics of this process. Yet, most of the problems could be resolved through an understanding of these dynamics.

Change in itself represents the following steps:

1. awareness of the problems
2. examination of the problems
3. arriving at a direction
4. implementation of action

This view of the process leaves out the human factors involved and is typical of how we tend to analyze it. Embodied in every step is the great potential for evoking anxiety which can block the whole endeavor.

The recognition that all is not well in any aspect of teaching is often taken as a sign of failure and evokes feelings of shame and a sense of guilt. This particular emotional set can be an overwhelming block to a free recognition of actual problems. The act of examining what we have been doing also magnifies guilt and anxiety. An honest look at the factors can confront one with unknowns and the possibility of frightening solutions. Decision making always has the potential for activating anxiety since it is an opportunity for exposure to failure. The point of action represents a continuation of this anxiety. Many projects have been carried through to the verge of action only to be blocked by the fear of failure. Anxiety, at the point of action, can precipitate euphoria. This adds a great deal of impetus to a project, but it is based on a denial of the anxiety rather than a working through of the feelings. Such denial is also a refusal to recognize oppositional forces. The euphoria readily collapses if not fed by rapid, positive reaction.

Other than anxiety we are also dealing with abandonment, giving up the known for the unknown, insecurity, and realistic and unrealistic shame and guilt. Unfortunately, these feelings do not just result in discomfort to the individual, but they tend to change their thinking, and they create a pattern of defensive reactions. This defensive position can destroy the perception of a need for change or worse yet, precipitate (a fear motivated) counter-reaction to change.

This conference was convened since the people involved at all levels were concerned with confronting the problems in education. Even so, among those present, the thesis that there is a need to humanize the humanities did produce a defensive response. Remarks indicated that a critical examination would result in the elimination of the teaching of a subject, for example, History. This extreme possibility was then discussed with the intensity of a survival reaction. This reminds me of the techniques of reducing an issue to absurdity,

which may be appropriate in high school debate circles, but serves poorly to maintain discourse once a problem is recognized We could proceed by eliminating these extreme possibilities and then reduce the defensive response. This approach, however, would eliminate the change of discovering that certain institutions or procedures are inefficient or destructive at their core. The burden then for maintaining discourse is on all participants in the interaction. Assailing of the status quo with violent and exaggerated claims tends to establish stronger feelings of security. The price for the "security" can be destructive to the eventual goal. A need for security which demands absoluteness produces a limitation of the range of possibilities.

One of the discussants shared with us his retrospective experience over a life-time of teaching. What I heard was a description of his devotion to scholarship until he reached his educational goal. Then he gradually refocused his attention to the problem of reaching and teaching students. He talked about the freeing experience of security born of success. Can we turn to being interested in humans only when we have this form of security, if then, or can our conception of security, both type and quantity, be redefined so that gratification may be more universally experienced?

When I began my career as a psychiatrist I viewed each new case with a mixture of interest, curiosity and apprehension. I shared my patients expectation that I possessed answers to whatever problems may have concerned them. As long as a response was made to either my need or my patients need for me to be an authority, I was insecure. When the experience was redefined, I did not function in the role of an authority which was inappropriate, undesirable, and inefficient. It was then possible to anticipate a new patient without anxiety, secure in the knowledge that I could explore with that person what their experiences had been, and offer them help in evaluating their life style. This did not eliminate my patients wishes that I be the possessor of all truth, but it prevented a "folly of two".

The act of teaching seems similarly affected by the expectations of the student and the teacher. It is further compounded by a system of rewards and punishment for both which have a continuing effect. The student must view the subject matter from the same frame of reference as the teacher or he will be punished. In this system the teacher is the "possessor of truth".
In contrast, the teacher whose major security mechanism is based on a facilitation of the pupils learning can gain daily gratification, and to that extent be immune to a dehumanizing power structure.

Programs were discussed particularly in the areas of black studies and elementary education which had gone through the various stages of change. They have been activated in the face of much opposition. The degree of negative reaction seemed to have not been anticipated and resulted in discouragement and hostile counter-reactions. Perhaps it is necessary to emphasize the need for patience and perspective in attempting new projects even though these are commonly used as modes of thwarting change by those supporting the status quo. If the hostile response is anticipated, steps can be taken to reassure the individuals caught up in these feelings.

The most easily identifiable position is that of the TTT. It is truly an outside force which is not involved in the process of education but which is dedicated to it's evaluation and modification. In an open-ended process that is functioning and changing without consultation, it is difficult to gain any clear perspective. In fact a clear perspective is almost evidence, in itself, that such a view is inaccurate.

The concept of influences rather than control certainly fits the historical reality. The function of attempting to remove barriers to growth is a major contribution to learning by TTT. With obvious irony let's call this "negative

creativity". The identification of practices that do not contribute to a problem solving climate is the easier function. The more difficult function is the identification and handling of the security aspects which are attached to methods that need to be abandoned. The other vital role of negative creativity is to support a broad area of personal security and freedom, and to allow those involved time to seek more efficient solutions. Whenever we attempt to give up the familiar, the combination of demands upon us as civilized creatures is very great.

Notes on How to Teach
Gathered at an Ugly and Gross Hotel in Miami

Dr. Paul A. Olson
University of Nebraska

At the beginning of the Miami conference of The Year of the Liberal Arts, I endeavored to describe several incidents which involved what I thought to be genuine acts of teaching--act of teaching done during the recent student strike over Cambodia at the University of Nebraska. These acts of teaching had to do with teaching as requiring some deep honesty (a psychology professor recognizing an error in counseling style when he publically chastised a "stoned" student for giving political advice while stoned); teaching as requiring a capacity for spontaneous symbol-making (students threatening to burn faculty position papers which did not communicate to them, and a black student stopping them not to prevent them from expressing themselves but to preclude the repression of their "right to express," being able to stop them because he knew that they knew (and respected) his knowledge of what repression is); teaching as requiring the carrying of a research set into crisis circumstances (the failure of professional researchers on the right and on the left to observe adequate research techniques when creating an injunction or developing a position during the strike; the remarkably honest concern of other students, faculty researchers, and administrators for "the truth of the circumstances").

I mean by using these incidents to describe "teaching" as an act or gesture or "statement" which changes how people think and how they act, particularly when the chips are down.

In extending the perceptions gained from the strike, I advanced the following notions:

I. We do teach in a crisis time for the teaching act--whether we have further strikes or not;

II. The challenge to the tradition of the "teaching role" is part of a general challenge to ascriptive authority as opposed to power won in strategic-contestive arenas; to learn to teach in the new arenas is like learning to play chess with a strategic antagonist after having been the "It" figure in "Mother May I." (cf. Bryan Sutton-Smith's researches);

III. The ways in which the teaching we have differs from the teaching we ought to have is directly proportionate to the differences which separate the ways in which children organize themselves into groups when they are left by themselves from the ways in which they are organized into groups when they are placed in school classrooms under a teacher;

IV. Teaching takes place best when the person teaching knows the aesthetic of the "group organization" and the kinesic system of the group to whom he addresses himself (for instance, the circle aesthetic in black culture, described by Herskowitz and Roger Abrahams).

V. Teaching takes place in, and must offer to the student, the actual world where knowledge is won; we cannot have organized for rhetorical performance and offering primarily verbal knowledge in an empirical age.

VI. Finally teaching offers a world where someone <u>can tell somebody something else:</u>

<u>Martin Buber and a modern inability</u>[1]

Once Martin Buber lectured in Czernowitz; afterward, as he was sitting in a restaurant continuing the discussion with a few of his audience, a middle-aged Jew came in. He introduced himself, and then sat down and followed the abstract discussion, which must have been unusual to his ears, with great interest. He declined every invitation to advance a comment, but at the close of the discussion he came to Buber and said, "I want to ask

---

[1] J.H. van den Berg, <u>The Changing Nature of Man</u>.

you something. I have a daughter and she knows a young man who has been studying law. He passed all his examinations with honors. What I would like to know is: would he be a reliable man?" Buber was taken by surprise by this question, and answered, "I assume from your words that he is industrious and able." But apparently this was not what the other man really meant to ask, for he proceeded, "But could you tell me--I would like to know this particularly--would he be clever?" "That is rather more difficult to answer," Buber said, "but I presume that merely with diligence he could not have achieved what he did." The other man was still not satisfied, and finally the question he really meant to ask came out. "Herr Doctor, should he become a solicitor or a barrister?" "That I cannot tell you," answered Buber, "for I do not know your future son-in-law, and even if I did know him, I would not be able to give you advice in this matter." The other man thanked him and left, obviously disappointed.

"How could he know?" cries out Buber's modern contemporary, as if action were founded on knowledge. Of course Buber could not know. But nobody asked him to know. What he had been asked for was advice--judgment, not knowledge. Advice and judgment, of course, fitting the occasion, and applicable to this man: someone who entered in this particular way, who asked his question in this particular manner and who looked like him; a man who presumable had such-and-such kind of a daughter; advice which fit this vague, very vague, totality, but primarily advice, a certainty, a wise word, a word that would have brought structure to this vague totality; an answer which would have erected a beacon, so that the sailing would no longer be dangerous. "He should become a barrister." These words, if spoken by Buber, by a sage, by a man who looked and spoke like one, a man

who apparently knew,--these words would have been the strongest foundation for the future son-in-law's choice of profession. How could he have gone wrong if his career had been initiated by such advice? The answer would have created its own rightness; it would have created truth. Is not truth, truth in the relation between man and man, basically the effect of a fearlessness toward the other person? Is not truth, above all, a result, a made up thing, a creation of the sage? The person who knows creates the future by speaking.

What I heard at the conference were useful, and sometimes profound, modifications of, or contradictions of these positions: the positions set down below may suggest what I heard or learned.

A. To "humanize" is to give to the individual the capacity to control himself and to determine the way in which he is to enter into the life of the group (of Artistotle's Politics, Book I); it is also to give to the cultural group the capacity to organize itself on the basis of its inner needs and impulses as opposed to responding to the commands and demands of an outside group. It may be the role of the dominated cultural group 'to take' rather than to be given (II, compare above for the differences).

B. To "humanize" is to embody rather than to "give training in" (teaching as honesty). The question of training as opposed to embodiment came up as follows: "Should one teach a course in non-violence by studying the history of Ghandi's life, or should one teach a course in non-violence by giving training in methods of developing non-violent responses to violent situations in America?" I came to feel that I would opt for the latter (cf. the opening paragraph above).

C. To "humanize" teaching is to perceive the child as a real 'other'-- a real "thou" in Buber's terms. We asked the question, "How does one come to know what the child is in order to teach to what he is? How does one know his cognitive frame, his mythic frame, his inner desires and fantasies?" We gave few cogent answers (cf. II, above).

D. To teach is not to fear the student, whoever he is. It is clear that the conference still exposed and expressed, rather honestly, the fear of 'the community,' its representatives and its students. To fear the community is another instance of the fear of being taught by "the other"-- what Arrowsmith called hubris at Phoenix. This fear of being taught by the other exists both in the community and in the academic establishment (cf. II-III above).

E. To teach is to accept responsibility. It was clear to the discussion leaders at the conference we--all of us at the conference--had difficulty in accepting responsibility for the teaching function; it was common, at this conference, to hear people say "Our basic problem is that the teachers are so dumb"; "Our basic problem is that the school superintendents are such jackasses." It was not common for the people to say "I failed as a teacher; that is why no learning took place" (cf. II & VI, above).

F. To teach is to be capable of being reached by the "other's" information: The problem of arrogance appeared in the form of attitudes which implied such positions as "My cognitive map is better than your cognitive map"; "My plan for reform is more sophisticated than yours." In teaching one another, we talk competitively even as we talk about the humanization as cooperation. One of the central insights--commonplace as anything and, yet, important-- was the insight that we must change the conditions under which people relate to one another if they are to relate in terms of different values,

schemes, and response structures (cf. II, III, IV, above).

G. To teach is to be cosmopolitan; it is to be non-hierarchial in orientation rather than a hierarchial non-ethnocentric rather than ethnocentric (cf. II, III, above).

H. To teach is to manifest many styles. We asked a question as to the importance of college teaching styles: "Can we identify a range of teaching styles which exists in colleges: Rogerian teaching styles, Skinnerian teaching styles?"; "What is one teaching about behavior when one exhibits a certain behavior while 'teaching?' Maslow, Rogers, Skinner: what is a teacher? Is he a person who primarily loves, or primarily gives knowledge? Is he a person who primarily learns, who primarily knows? Is he a surrogate parent, a surrogate servant, or a surrogate friend?" The conference gave rise to a fairly deep and general commitment to a transactional view of learning (cf. VI, above).

I. To "teach" is no more to do a single thing than "to create art" is to do one thing [cf. Wittgenstein on seeking for a "substance" for a "substantive" and on defining "games" (Philosophical Investigations).]

J. To teach is to ask good questions. It was categorically asserted that the disciplines are not now taught Socratically, that students are taught the disciplines as a series of categorical structures. They do not use the categorical structures as a way of asking questions or learn to develop 'categorical structures' by asking questions in those arenas where knowledge is won. (cf. II, above).

K. To teach is to be able to learn. There was a great deal of concern to place the community in the "liberal position" vis-a-vis the liberal arts; e.g. the Oglala Sioux community could teach the "liberal arts" community insofar as it respresents another vision of the world-- a vision different from

Adam Smith's vision or the vision described in Jules Henry's Man Against Culture. The community becomes liberating teacher for the liberal arts college (cf. III, IV and VI, above).

Excerpts from Reactions Submitted by the Resource Persons

(see above, p. 4)

I. RESPONSES TO THE CONFERENCE ISSUES AND CHALLENGES

"Liberal arts and education professors can sit down together and discuss problems of teaching and learning. Not only do they have much in common to discuss, but they can enjoy 'rapping' about education. The chasm between liberal arts and education is not as deep and wide as most partisans imagine."

"Today's breed of educationist tends to be far more liberally educated than his predecessors and many modern liberal arts 'types' are more interested in teaching and learning questions than their predecessors."

"The discussion about the liberal arts was at best shallow, if at all present. There appeared to be very little carry-over from the Arizona conference to this one. Those that were present at the Miami conference were loathe to get into a discussion of liberal arts."

"In a good many of the discussions I attended, there was indeed not much discussion of the liberal arts but of the problems of the schools and approaches to teaching and organization that would be useful in the present situation. It was often difficult to discern who were the representatives of the disciplines and who of education. To some extent though a useful purpose was served, it was a different purpose from what the focus of the conference was alleged to be."

"None of the participants, i.e., Liberal Arts, education, schools, communities, etc., really want to change. Each believes it has a toehold on 'truth' and hope that other people will discover it."

"It seems to me that the change in character of the world much less the United States indicates that we have to begin a far more humanistic approach in terms of education. We have to begin certainly with the very young to help people feel comfortable about being human beings. I'm not certain that TTT is dealing with that issue."

"In those discussions in which I participated there was great concern about the nature of teaching and what the purpose of education today should be. There were those in the groups in which I participated who felt that teaching consists primarily of relieving the tensions and coping with the frustrations of present-day children and youth. There were others who felt that we have gone too far in these directions and have neglected the more traditional emphases on teaching 'subject matter' to children. We did not resolve these differences, nor did we arrive at a consensus on what the nature of teaching should be today. It was not so much a philosophical matter in the classical concept of what teaching is or should be, but rather what teaching should consist of today that concerned the participants."

"There is as much need for liberalizing and humanizing in the professional studies of education these days as is needed in the so called liberal studies. Although conference talk focused on liberal education in terms of taking it to task for its present day lack of liberalization and humanization, any sensitive educationist could not

help but apply the same criticism to much of the teaching in the professional sequence. To be liberalizing professional studies must not be prescriptive but be open ended investigations of teaching and learning. They must deal with the human aspects of education rather than being so involved with the mechanics of instruction even though they can be so sophisticated today."

"There seems to be a great deal of interest in divorcing teacher preparation programs from the sterility of the college campus. This is being accomplished by having the actual college classes meet in the public school, accompanied by laboratory sessions in the school. This has the effect of involving the classroom teachers and administrators as well as the college students and professors.

In some instances Arts and Science professors are actually assuming the responsibility of teaching in the public school. I can see a very profound change in attitude resulting from this type of activity."

"Switching for a moment, I learned two things which were professionally rewarding and possible ground for further development. First, I found that the construct of blending was socially and empirically useful in distinguishing the pluralistic groups which exist in our society. The problems of many Mexican-Americans, in terms of building a stake, is the fact they blend. This concept not only reaffirmed my contention, but was no doubt useful to the Mexican-Americans in the Minority Studies Session. The problem takes on a different focus: what does it mean to have minority studies for a population that blends into the social fabric; or, alternatively, how do you use minority studies as a vehicle for group cohesion when the group easily

attaches to the wider system of which it is not a part, but may believe itself to be so because it is seldom confronted because it is attached."

"Another area that seems to be missing in TTT is that they are not preparing people to deal with small educational organisms that exist outside the walls of the schools. A number of these smaller institutions, i.e. Street Academies, Satellite Learning Centers, Free Schools,and I suppose we should toss in the South's new private schools.

TTT cannot overlook their responsibility in preparing people to deal with the vast amount of education that goes on in a less traditional setting with a smaller group of people."

"Some continuing difficulties that persist in many TTT projects: A very difficult time in understanding or believing the parity concept. Project directors do not believe that it is terribly important to have parity with either the community or school districts. It is looked upon as a necessary evil to get funding, but not one that really brings about any meaningful change in the situation. In fact, it is an irritant."

"I would question whether "special studies" as a topic was of general enough interest. I felt it might not have been except for a very few. However, my groups may have been unique in the fact that they shied away from this topic."

II. REACTIONS TO THE CONFERENCE STRUCTURE AND FORMAT

"First, let me state that I felt it was an excellent conference. I was most impressed by the balance between structure and freedom. Meetings were frequent enough to keep everyone working. Agendas propelled people into topics rather rapidly, yet allowed individuals to change focus when necessary. Topics were varied enough to meet most needs and breaks were numerous enough to allow for needed 'small talk' sessions.

Another positive feature of the conference was some subtle planning that put everyone on a 'peer' basis. I did not feel there were any 'bosses' or 'experts'. Heads of schools, U.S. Office people and conference leaders did not pull rank. I think this might have been one of the most important factors leading to a successful conference.

Perhaps my major criticism would be aimed at my role as a consultant and the way the role was structured. It would have been very helpful to me to know ahead of time the focus of each TTT group, their composition and their goals. Likewise, I do wish the vitae we had prepared had been distributed among the groups. I recognize too much of this might deter from the 'peer' feeling stated above, but some of it would have helped. I never quite felt until near the very end that I knew where I could best fit."

"As you may recall, I was not impressed by the proposal for this event, and I worried that the heavy emphasis on discussion and the rather loose structure and the curious way that the questions were posed would result in something inchoate. TTT staff work appears to

have been useful in stimulating stronger organization without destroying the basic concept. The result was much more successful that I had dreamed possible. Interest remained high and few left the hotel or 'goofed off' from the sessions; attendance was excellent even in the final meeting."

"I think that I would rather spend more time in sessions where the entire group gets a common head. The small group meetings tend to break down into bull sessions. I don't know how often the conclusion at the end of a session was 'I'm just doing my thing.' More often than not, I interpret that to mean 'I don't know exactly what I'm doing.' or 'I'm not doing nothing.'"

"I had the personal reaction that there was little sharing among the directors of the various projects of what they are doing and for some reason there was too little opportunity for them to exchange views and to learn from each other. My overall reaction is that the conference was very worthwhile, because it did bring together people who, though they did so only to a small extent, did share some views, did open further their vistas, did raise some problems which they might not have thought of on their own."

"The overall program format seemed to be well planned and encouraged the active involvement of participants in substantive discussions with a minimum of time devoted to formal presentations. It was observed that in many cases it was almost impossible to distinguish between liberal arts and education people because the organizational structure forced the groups to focus in on a particular issue. The fact that each group was composed of both the people who

felt that they could contribute to the understanding of an issue and those seeking to learn more about it undoubtedly contributed to the success of this procedure."

"The challenges of the student movement and the 'teach ins' have made the issues of liberalizing and humanizing college instruction critical and of immediate concern. Many suggestions for beginning to resolve these issues were offered as groups tried to define the problems and consider the roots of present day lacks. The question remains whether those fired up by the discussion at Miami will continue their resolves to work at these problems at home, especially as they are concerned with the education of future teachers. One way for local TTT projects to assist this resolve is to set up similarly modeled conferences on the home campus to keep the concern alive and carry it to others in both the liberal and prfessional faculties. If such follow up conferences were to be planned, they should include at least some faculty from another TTT university."

"Finally, it was stated by participants that the same consultants should be used again. I agree with that recommendation; partly because I enjoyed the group, but also because I feel now that I could make a greater contribution."

APPENDICES

GREAT LAKES AND SOUTHERN CLUSTER WORKSHOP

CHALLENGES TO THE DISCIPLINES
CONTEXTS FOR THE LIBERAL ARTS

A FOLLOW-UP TO THE PHOENIX CONVERENCE
"THE YEAR OF THE LIBERAL ARTS"

Issues for the Workshop

I. Human Development
- Learning — and Disciplines?
- Humanization — and Humanities?
- Liberation — and Liberal Arts?

II. Studies for All Men
- Black Studies!
- Brown Studies!
- Asian Studies!
- White Studies!
- Disciplines? — Humanities? — Liberal Arts?

III. Teachers and Teaching
- The Teaching Act — Liberation
- Teaching Involvement — Humanization
- Content and Curriculum — Discipline
- Liberal Arts? — Humanities? — Disciplines?

Sunday, June 21, 1970

3:00 - 7:00 p.m.

Registration and Informal Get-Together

7:00 p.m.

The Workshop — Structure and Purpose

7:15 p.m.

Responses to the issues — written individually by participants

8:00 p.m.

Presentation of the Issues

Keynoters — Synthesizers

John Zell

Psychiatrist-Psychoanalyst in private practice, Phoenix, Arizona; M.D., University of Minnesota: Psychiatric training, Temple University. Dr. Zell is a teacher and a consultant to numerous training institutes and learned societies. He is a member of the Southern California Psychoanalytic Institute and was a winner of the Franz Alexander Award in 1967 for research in dynamics of ego ideal.

Paul Olson

Foundation Professor of English, University of Nebraska. Ph.D., Princeton University. A Medievalist, Dr. Olson is the author of many articles on English literature. In conjunction with his activities as Co-Director of Nebraska's Curriculum Development Center, he became director of the Tri-University Project in Elementary Education, one of the three original projects that culminated in the TTT Program, in which he has been extensively involved.

Anthony Campbell

Assistant to the President, Director of Experimental Programs, and National Manager for Market Research, *Responsive Environment Corporations*. Manager, Behavior System Research, *MMM Company*. B.A., Howard University; S.T.M., D.T.H., Boston University. Dr. Campbell is associated with the National Youth Program Unit and the City and Area Task Force on Job Opportunity, Washington, D.C., and is a consultant to the U.S.O.E. and various State Departments of Education and institutions of higher education

9:00 p.m.

First Group Session

Participants grouped by issue

Small group rooms to be announced

Monday, June 22, 1970

9:00 a.m.

Second Group Session

Members assigned to groups by *issue* with combinations of resource persons, contributors, explorers

11:30 a.m.

Luncheon

Seating by projects
Resource people assigned among projects
Arrange for 3:30 Resource Sessions

1:30 p.m.

Third Group Session

Members assigned to groups by *different issue* with combinations of resource persons, contributors, explorers

3:30 p.m.

Resource Sessions

Short sessions with keynoters and resource persons as arranged at lunch

5:00 p.m.

Cocktail Party at Dr. Herbert Wey's home
Buses will be provided for participants

Leave at 5:00 and Return at 7:30

(Refreshments — Courtesy University of Miami, University of Pittsburgh, Appalachian State University)

Tuesday, June 22, 1970

9:00 a.m.

Projects meet with resource people on project issues and problems

10:30 a.m.

A. Projects meet individually to write project reports

B. Consultants meet by issue to write reports

C. Keynoters — synthesizers prepare outlines of synthesis

Noon

Luncheon

A. *Three keynoters present synthesis*

Dr. Anthony Campbell
Dr. Paul Olson
Dr. John Zell

B. *New Directions*

USOE Representatives
LTI — Community and Liberal Arts

C. *Participant reaction and response*

3:30 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Conference Co-Chairmen

Dr. John A. Guthrie
University of Pittsburgh

Dr. Herbert Wey
Appalachian State University

Dr. Verne Faust
University of Miami

WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

Mark Adams
TTT Project
School of Education
University of Miami
Coral Gables, Florida 33124

Edward Barnes
Community Representative
1416 Colmbs Avenue
Pgh., Pa.

William F. Benjamin, Director
College of Education
University of South Florida
Tampa, Florida 33620

David Bennett
Syracuse University
Sytacuse, New York

Alma Berry
1015 First Avenue
Charleston, West Virginia 25302

Gerald Brooks
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York

Dr. Robert Buttel, Chairman
Department of English
Temple University
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Kenneth Cadenhead, Director
TTT Project
School of Education
Auburn University
Auburn, Alabama 36830

Don L. Clark
Appalachian State University
Boone, North Carolina 28608

Norma Cochran
TTT Project
School of Education
University of Miami
Coral Gables, Florida 33124

Robert Cole
College of Education
University of South Florida
Tampa, Florida 33620

James Collins
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York

Rev. Canice Connors
TTT Project
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

Shirley Cooper
TTT Project
School of Education
University of Miami
Coral Gables, Florida 33124

Janet Cox
TTT Project
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

Herb Dandes
School of Education
University of Miami
Coral Gables, Florida 33124

Mr. Baltazar Davila
Associate Director
Aspira of Pennsylvania
526 West Gerard Avenue
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Nancy Elman
Administrative Asst.
TTT Project
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

Verne Faust
TTT Project
School of Education
University of Miami
Coral Gables, Florida 33124

Jerry Felz
TTT Project
School of Education
University of Miami
Coral Gables, Florida 33124

Carolyn Garwood
School of Education
University of Miami
Coral Gables, Florida 33124

Harold Gibbard
West Virginia Department of Education
741 Augusta Avenue
Morgantown, West Virginia 26505

Mr. Saul Grossman
Jones Junior High School
Ann & Memphis St.
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19134

John A. Guthrie
Director-TTT Cluster
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

Ed Harrill
Appalachian State University
Boone, North Carolina 28608

Dr. George Harrington
Associate Dean
College of Liberal Arts
Temple University
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Mr. William Hawley
College of Education
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

Mr. William Helder
Coordinator Social Studies
3426 So. Cedar Street
Lansing, Michigan 48910

John B. Herron
Administrative Associate
TTT Project
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

John Higgins
University of South Florida
Tampa, Florida 33620

Dr. Alan M. Hollingsworth
Chairman, Department of English
Morrill Hall
East Lansing, Michigan

Mr. Gerald Hughes
3331 Altamont Avenue
Cleveland Heights, Ohio 44118

Andrew R. Hughey
TTT Project
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

Dean John Ivey
College of Education
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

James Jackson
Appalachian State University
Boone, North Carolina 28608

Mrs. Elaine Jett
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

Whittington B. Johnson
TTT Project
School of Education
University of Miami
Coral Gables, Florida 33124

Dale Kallstron
TTT Project
School of Education
University of Miami
Coral Gables, Florida 33124

George Keem
George Peabody College for Teachers
Nashville, Tennessee 37200

Herb Kimmel
College of Education
University of South Florida
Tampa, Florida 33620

Dr. Robert Klotman
Professor, School of Music
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana 47401

Esther Kresh
Research Associate
Board of Education
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

Dr. DeWayne Kurpius
School of Education
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

Mr. Brian Larkin
502 Maxwell Hall
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York

Cal Leonard
School of Education
University of Miami
Coral Gables, Florida 33124

Dr. Herbert K. Livingston
3039 Seminole
Detroit, Michigan 48214

Joseph Logan
Appalachian State University
Boone, North Carolina 28607

Patrick Malley
TTT Project
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

Robert Marshall
Department of English
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

Mr. William Martin
East Syracuse Millia School
Syracuse, New York

Dr. Richard McArdle
Department of Education
Cleveland State University
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

C.H. Moffat
Marshall University
Huntington, West Virginia 25701

Keven Morse
TTT Project
School of Education
University of Miami
Coral Gables, Florida 33124

Dr. John Needham
School of Education
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

Laura Newell
School of Education
Auburn University
Auburn, Alabama 36830

Eddie Nunn
College of Education
University of South Florida
Tampa, Florida 33620

Dr. Jacob E. Nyenhuis
1418 Lakepoint
Grosse Pointe Park, Michigan 48230

Robert Olberg
TTT Project
School of Education
Univesrity of Miami
Coral Gables, Florida 33124

Curtis Osburn
TTT Project
School of Education
Univesrity of Miami
Coral Gables, Florida 33124

Perry Phillips
West Virginia Department of Education
1715 Franklin Avenue
Charleston, West Virginia 25309

Dr. William Pilder
Indian University
Bloomington, Indiana

Bob Pines
School of Education
University of Miami
Coral Gables, Florida 33124

Mr. Ray Prada
Assistant Dean
2901 Hampton Road, Apt. 19
Cleveland, Ohio 44120

Fred Quale
TTT Project
School of Education
University of Miami
Coral Gables, Florida 33124

Robert Richardson
Appalachian State Univesrity
Boone, North Carolina 28608

Kent Robinson
Appalachian State University
Boone, North Carolina 28608

Sybil Robison
Auburn University
Auburn, Alabama 36830

Dr. Alvin W. Rose
2299 Oakland Boulevard
Detroit, Michigan 49238

Elliot Ross
Cleveland State University
Euclid Avenue & 24th St.
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Charles P. Ruch
Associate Director
TTT Cluster
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

Mr. Joseph Sales
17315 Ohio
Detroit, Michigan

Dr. Jerome Schneewind
Dean - College of Arts & Sciences
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

Barton Schwartz
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York

Charles E. Scott
Vanderbuilt University
875 Robertson Academy Rd.
Nashville, Tennessee 37220

Ralph Scott
Director of Instructional Services
Board of Education
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

Ted Shoaf
TTT Project
School of Education
University of Miami
Coral Gables, Florida 33124

Mr. Thomas Slook
Assistant Professor
Mathematics Department
Temple University
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Dr. E. Brooks Smith
507 Lakeview
Burmington, Michigan 48009

Dr. Gerald Smith
Center for Innovation Teacher Education
School of Education
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

William Smith
Auburn University
Auburn, Alabama 36830

Dr. Laurence M. Sommers
Chairman, Department of Geography
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

Harold S. Spraker
Middle Tennessee State University
Rte. 6
Murfreesboro, Tennessee 37130

Charles Stanley
TTT Project
School of Education
University of Miami
Coral Gables, Florida 33124

Paul Stanton
Reading & Language Arts
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Harold Stauffer
TTT Project
School of Education
University of Miami
Coral Gables, Florida 33124

William D. Stevens
University of South Florida
Tampa, Florida 33620

Doris Stiles
School of Education
University of Miami
Coral Gables, Florida 33124

Dean Richard Sullivan
College Arts & Letters
East Lansing, Michigan

Dr. Robert D. Swartz
Lafayette Towers West
Apartment 408
Detroit, Michigan 48207

Dana Swick
George Peabody College
Nashville, Tennessee 37220

Charlton Tebeau
University of Miami
Coral Gables, Florida 33124

Robert Polk Thomson
George Peabody College
Nashville, Tennessee 37220

John Thornton
TTT Project
School of Education
University of Miami
Coral Gables, Florida 33124

Rose Trattner
Department of English
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

Richard Warner
TTT Project
University of Miami
School of Education
Coral Gables, Florida 33124

Joseph Werlinich
Counselor Education Department
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

Dr. Sam Wiggins
Cleveland State University
Euclid Avenue at 24th Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Bennie Wiley
TTT Project
School of Education
University of Miami
Coral Gables, Florida 33124

Cratis Williams
Appalachian State University
Boone, North Carolina 28608

Mr. James Williams
School of Education CITE
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

John F. Williams
Appalachian State University
Boone, North Carolina 28608

Malcolm D. Williams
George Peabody College for Teachers
Nashville, Tennessee 37220

Edward C. Williamson
Auburn University
Auburn Alabama

J. Zeb Wright, Director
TTT Project
West Virginia Dept. of Education
1717 Franklin Avenue
Charleston, West Virginia 25309

James M. Yonts, Director
TTT Project
George Peabody College for Teachers
Nashville, Tennessee 37203

Dr. John Zimmer
Asst. Dean, College of Natural Science
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

KEYNOTER - SYNTHESIZERS

Dr. Anthony Campbell
Vice President
Washington Technical Institute
6459 31st Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Dr. Paul Olson
Professor of English
University of Nebraska
14th and R Street
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508

Dr. John Zell
Psychiatry-Psychoanalysis
Suite D
3352 East Camelback Road
Phoenix, Arizona 85018

U.S.O.E.

Donald Bigelow
Director,Div. of College Programs
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C. 20202

Charles Lovett
Special Assistant
Division of College Programs
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C. 20202

Shirley Radcliffe
Education Program Specialist
TTT Branch
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C. 20202

Allen Schmieder
Chief, TTT Branch
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C. 20202

Mary Jane Smalley
Deputy Chief
TTT Branch
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C. 20202

Donald Tuttle
Education Program Specialist
TTT Branch
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C. 20202

Joseph Vaughn
Management Intern
TTT Branch
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C. 20202

Russell Wood
Deputy Associate Commissioner
Bureau of Educational Personnel Dev.
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C. 20202

LEADERSHIP TRAINING INSTITUTE

Dr. Saul B. Cohen
Dean, Graduate School
Clark University
Worcester, Massachusetts 01610

Dr. Dorothy Fraser
Box 156
West Redding, Connecticut 66896

Mr. Anthony Gibbs
Assistant Director
Woodlawn Organization
1135 East 63rd Street
Chicago, Illinois 60637

Mrs. Dorothee Gaffney
101 W. Yorktown Apartments
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122

Mr. Jack D. Gordon
1701 Meridian Avenue
Miami Beach, Florida 33139

Mr. James Tanner
Assistant Superintendent for
Curriculum and Instruction
Cleveland Public Schools
Cleveland, Ohio 44101

Resource Persons

Mr. John Brown
Director, Urban Education Department
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

Dr. Allan Brownsword
Lecturer from Horace Mann Foundation
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts 01002

Dr. John Creswell
Coordinator of Mathematics Education
School of Education
University of Houston
Houston, Texas 77004

Dr. Norman Dodl
Director, Elementary Education Model Program
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306

Dr. Wallace W. Douglas
Professor of English & Education
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois 60201

Mrs. Marjorie Farmer
Curriculum Specialist, English Language Arts
School District of Philadelphia
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

Dr. Richard L. Foster
Superintendent of Schools
Berkeley Unified School District
Berkeley, California 94709

Dr. Arthur Gumbrell
Principal, Carmel Unified School District
Carmel, California 93921

Dr. William A. Jenkins
Dean, School of Education
Portland State University
Portland, Oregon 97207

Dr. Norman Johnson
Professor of Social Policy
Director, Joint Urban Science Information Institute
Carnegie-Mellon University
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Mr. Rudolpho Juarez
Migrant Worker Specialist
Organized Migrants and Community Action
Homestead, Florida

Mr. Roger Landrum
The Teachers, Inc.
New York, New York 10002

Dr. Charles Leyba
Director, Project Maestro
School of Education
California State College
Los Angeles, California 90032

Dr. Irving Morrissett
Professor of Economics
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado

Dr. William Norin
Associate Superintendent
Charter Oak Unified School District
Covina, California

Mr. William Row
School Psychologist
Child Study
East Rose Lane
Phoenix, Arizona

- - -

Project Directors

SOUTHERN CLUSTER

Dr. Herbert Wey
Director, TTT Cluster
President, Appalachian State University

Dr. Cratis Williams
Dean of the Graduate School
Appalachian State University

Dr. Marvin Dawson
Associate Professor of Education
Auburn University

Mr. James M. Yonts, Jr.
Director of TTT
George Peabody College for Teachers

Dr. Verne Faust
Professor of Education
University of Miami

Dr. John M. Higgins
Associate Professor of Education
University of South Florida

Dr. J. Zeb Wright
Director of TTT
West Virginia State Department of Education

GREAT LAKES CLUSTER

Dr. John A. Guthrie
Director, TTT Cluster
Associate Professor of Education
University of Pittsburgh

Dr. Sam Wiggins
Dean, College of Education
Cleveland State University

Dr. Gerald Smith
Professor of Education
Indiana University

Dr. William Hawley (Co-Director)
Associate Dean, College of Education
Michigan State University

Mr. Joseph Vellanti (Co-Director)
Eastern High School
Lansing School District

Dr. Roy A. Price
Professor of Social Science and Education
Syracuse University

Dr. Jesse Rudnick
Associate Professor of Mathematics Education
Curriculum and Instruction
Temple University

Dr. John A. Guthrie
Associate Professor of Education
University of Pittsburgh

Dr. E. Brooks Smith
Professor of Education
Department of Elementary Education
College of Education
Wayne State University

This workshop was made possible by grants from the U.S. Office of Education to the University of Miami and the University of Pittsburgh.

. . . This is a book only by necessity. More seriously, it is an effort in human actuality, in which the reader is no less centrally involved than the authors and those of whom they tell. Those who wish actively to participate in the subject, in whatever degree of understanding, friendship, or hostility, are invited to address the authors in care of the publishers. In material that is used, privately or publicly, names will be withheld on request.

JAMES AGEE